

Mr. SMITH. I do understand that in some States there has been the provision of matching funds by State action. No survey of the States that I know of exists, and I do not know in how many places that has happened. In none of the three States that we represent have matching funds been supplied by the State legislatures or by State action.

Mr. BRADEMAs. I have just remarked on the fact that one might expect more forward looking and imaginative leadership from your States than out of some others. In view of the fact that States could expect to benefit from the kinds of programs supported here, why this abdication of State responsibility?

Mr. SMITH. Well, of course, I should be glad to try to answer that, but I would have to say that I have to be guessing about peoples' intentions. I think that the problem in our State legislatures is not unlike what seems to me to be a problem sometimes in Congress, that where you have already done a good deal in particular areas, it seems all the harder to find extra funds for similar purposes.

So that, it has been proposed in each of our States that State funds should be made available. Such a proposal has not yet been successful. I hope that we might be able to report in another year or two that it would be and, of course, if State funds did become available upon a fairly wide basis to supply matching funds, then the question of 75-25, 50-50 would be a much less relevant question than it is today.

Mr. BRADEMAs. That is exactly, of course, why I raised this question. I take it that it is not unconstitutional in any of the States represented by you three gentlemen for your State legislature to vote some money for these purposes?

Mr. SMITH. Actually that is a question in New York State where you can divide both the members of the legislature and the public as to whether it is constitutional.

Mr. BRADEMAs. For your church-supported institutions?

Mr. SMITH. Yes, and private. There is some hesitation about that because if you say private then that presumably includes church supported. But certainly I think a majority opinion in the legislature now is in favor of such support as shown by the reception of the Bundy report which is concerned with higher education but not higher continuing education.

Mr. BRADEMAs. Do either of you other gentlemen have a comment?

Dr. THOMPSON. I think part of it is on the uncertainty of title I and its funding, so that, if there were to be a more significant statement as to the future of the act that the possibility of persuading the State legislatures to appropriate funds for matching purposes would be increased greatly, but there has been a great deal of uncertainty with respect to the total act.

Our legislature adjourned in June of last year and will not convene again until January of next year. This was in this period. Now, the possibility of this kind of action in the next legislature is greatly increased, I think, and would be substantially increased if there were something more definite with respect to the act.

Mr. SMITH. This is part of the early funding.

Dr. THOMPSON. That is right.

Mr. BANOVETZ. This was specifically part of the case in Illinois. When our legislature last met in early 1967 or just prior to the meeting of the legislature the word we had received at that time indicated